REMARKS

Claims 1 to 11 were pending in the application at the time of examination. Claims 1 to 11 stand rejected as anticipated.

Applicants have amended the description to correct grammatical errors. Also, a review of the drawings indicated that Fig. 12 includes two instances of reference numeral 1240; Fig. 17 includes two instances of reference numeral 1720; and Fig. 24 includes two instances of reference numeral 2420. Applicants have amended the specification so that the "end with failure" element in Fig. 12 has reference numeral 1245; "user data 10" element in Fig. 17 has reference numeral 1721; and "user data 10" element in Fig. 24 has reference numeral 2421. These amendments add clarity by giving each distinct element in the drawings a distinct reference numeral and so do not add new matter. Applicants are obtaining corrected drawings and will submit replacement sheets under separate cover when the corrected drawings are received.

Applicants note that no §112 rejections were given in the instant application. Applicants have amended Claims 7 to 9 and 11 to correct a minor antecedent basis informality. Since no §112 rejections were given, these amendments do not affect the scope of the claims and so do not affect the patentability of the claims. Claim 5 is amended to correct a grammatical informality. Claims 1 to 4 are amended to make explicit that which was implicit in these claims, i.e., the party that performs the action.

Claims 1 to 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0039361 of Hawkes et al., hereinafter '361.

Prior to considering the rejection, Applicants respectfully note that '361 has a filing date of August 28, 2002, which is after Applicants' filing date of October 29, 2001. Accordingly, based upon the filing dates, '361 is not a

GUNNISON, McKAY & HODGSON, L.L.P.
Garden West Office Plaza
1900 Garden Road, Suite 220
Monterey, CA 93940
(831) 655-0880
Fax (831) 655-0888

proper reference. However, 361' is identified as a continuation in part of U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/933,972, which had a filing date of August 20, 2001. Public Pair was used to determine the status of U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/933,972 and Public Pair showed a U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0141591 A1, hereinafter referred to a '591.

A comparison of '361 with '591 shows that '361 included considerable information that was not included in '591. Accordingly, to the extent that the rejection relies upon information in '361 that does not appear in '591, the rejection is not well founded, because the filing date for the information added in '361 is after Applicants' filing date.

The rejection cited the abstract, Figs. 1E to 14 and 18 to 24 and paragraphs [0052] et seq., [0070] et seq., and [0078] et seq. The Abstract in '361 includes two sentences (the last two) not in the Abstract in '591. Figs. 9 to 14 and 18 to 24 are not found in '591. Much of the basis for the rejection has a date that is after Applicants' filing date and so is not a proper reference. To the extent that the '361 is a proper reference, the information must have the filing data of the '591. To move the prosecution forward, Applicants have considered the information in '591, and to the extent that it quoted in the following response, reference will be made to both publications if it appears in both.

The rejection stated:

> As per claims 1-11, '361 teaches a method and apparatus for security in a data processing system comprising: privacy protection, identification, enrolling for a service, a randomized identifier, a communication network, a storage device, a smart card/UIM, authority peer group ID/content provider, cryptograms, credential data, credential request, a Kerberos ticket/message and service provider.

GUNNISON, McKAY & HODGSON, L.L.P.
Garden West Office Plaza
1900 Garden Road, Suite 220
Monterey, CA 93940
(831) 655-0880
Fax (831) 655-0888

Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of Claim 1. Applicants electronically searched '591 for any words that included "random" and the phrase only appeared in the following context.

> [0045] PGP combines features from symmetric and asymmetric encryption. FIGS. 1D and 1E illustrate a PGP cryptosystem 50, wherein a plaintext message is encrypted and recovered. In FIG. 1D, the plaintext message is compressed to save modem transmission time and disk space. Compression strengthens cryptographic security by adding another level of translation to the encrypting and decrypting processing. Most cryptanalysis techniques exploit patterns found in the plaintext to crack the cipher. Compression reduces these patterns in the plaintext, thereby enhancing resistance to cryptanalysis. Note that one embodiment does not compress plaintext or other messages that are too short to compress or which don't compress well aren't compressed.
>
> [0046] PGP then creates a session key, which is a one-time-only secret key. This key is a random number that may be generated from any random event(s), such as random movements of mouse and the keystrokes while typing. The session key works with a secure encryption algorithm to encrypt the plaintext, resulting in ciphertext. Once the data is encrypted, the session key is then encrypted to the recipient's public key. This public key-encrypted session key is transmitted along with the ciphertext to the recipient. (Emphasis added.)
>
> [0047] For decryption, as illustrated in FIG. 1E, the recipient's copy of PGP uses a private key to recover the temporary session key, which PGP then uses to decrypt the conventionally encrypted ciphertext. The combination of encryption methods takes advantage of the convenience of public key encryption and the speed of symmetric encryption. Symmetric encryption is generally much faster than public key encryption. Public key encryption in turn provides a solution to key distribution and data transmission issues. In combination, performance and key distribution are improved without any sacrifice in security.
>
> [0048] A key is a value that works with a cryptographic algorithm to produce a specific ciphertext. Keys are basically very large numbers. Key size is measured in bits. In public key cryptography, security increases with key size, however, public key size and the symmetric encryption private key size are not generally related. While the public and private keys are mathematically related, a difficulty arises in deriving a private key given only a public key. Deriving the private key is possible given enough time and computing power, making the selection of key size an important security issue. The goal is to have a large key that is secure, while maintaining key size sufficiently small for quick processing. An additional consideration is the expected interceptor, specifically, what is the importance of a message to a third party, and how much resource does a third party have to decrypt.

' 361, [0055] to [0058]

The session key, as quoted above, is generated on the user's system and so is not received "in response to enrolling," as recited in Claim 1. Applicants respectfully note that for an anticipation rejection the MPEP requires "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is

GUNNISON, McKAY & HODGSON, L.L.P.
Garden West Office Plaza
1900 Garden Road, Suite 220
Monterey, CA 93940
(831) 655-0880
Fax (831) 655-0888

contained in the ... claim.'" MPEP §2131, 8th Ed., Rev. 3, p. 2100-76 (August 2005). " Since the above text was the only portion of '591 with words that included "random," the reference fails to teach the invention to the same level of detail as recited in Claim 1. It is not enough that the reference teach generally a method of securing information transferred between two parties, the MPEP requires that the identical invention be shown. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 1.

Claims 2 to 4 each recite a "randomized ID." Accordingly, the above comments with respect to Claim 1 are applicable to each of these claims and so are incorporated herein by reference. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 2 to 4.

With respect to the anticipation rejection of Claim 5, Claim 5 recites in part:

> credential data;
> an authority peer group ID that identifies an entity that provided data authentication for said credential, said entity comprising a one or more network servers in a data communications network, one of said one or more network servers providing data authentication for said credential; and
> a cryptogram provided by said entity and used to authenticate said credential data.

To anticipate Claim 5, the '591 must include a teaching of a structure that includes this information in the same level of detail as recited in the claim. The '591 described a secret key RK when a user registered with a content server. However, this key is set up after the user registers. Accordingly, this teaching fails to teach or suggest that an authority peer group ID is stored with the credential data and with a cryptogram used to authenticate the credential data. The rejection has

GUNNISON, McKAY & HODGSON, L.L.P.
Garden West Office Plaza
1900 Garden Road, Suite 220
Monterey, CA 93940
(831) 655-0880
Fax (831) 655-0888

cited no teaching that the registration key is used to authenticate any credential data. If the Examiner continues the rejection, the Examiner is respectfully requested to cite with specificity what is considered the credential data, the authority peer group ID, and the cryptogram. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 5.

Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of Claim 6. The comments above with respect to a randomized identifier are incorporated herein by reference. Further, the rejection has failed to cite any teaching of

> said credential comprising:
> a randomized identifier;
> credential user data; and
> an indication of the credential user data verification performed by said authority in response to said credential request.

The various keys described in '591 fail to teach a credential having the three recited attributes. Therefore, the '591 fails to teach the invention in the same level of detail as recited in Claim 6. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 6.

Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of Claims 7 to 9. Each of Claims 7 to 9 recites in part, "said Kerberos ticket comprising a randomized user ID." As noted with respect to Claim 1 and incorporated herein by reference, '591 uses "random" only with respect to a PGP key. An electronic search of '591 failed to find any instance of either "ticket" or "Kerberos." Since the reference fails to include either word and includes "random" only with respect to a PGP key. The reference fails to meet the requirements of the MPEP with respect to an anticipation rejection as quoted above. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 7 to 9.

GUNNISON, McKAY & HODGSON, L.L.P.
Garden West Office Plaza
1900 Garden Road, Suite 220
Monterey, CA 93940
(831) 655-0880
Fax (831) 655-0888

Claim 10 has been cancelled and so the rejection is rendered moot.

Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of Claim 11. Claim 11 recites in part:

> a service provider configured to accept a service request and enrollment results obtained from an enrollment authority, **said service provider capable of communicating with said enrollment authority to verify said enrollment results**, said service provider configured to provide said service based upon said enrollment results and **a response from said enrollment authority** (Emphasis added)

The rejection has failed to cite any teaching of a service provider that is capable of communicating with an enrollment authority and that can provide a service based on a response from the enrollment authority. Accordingly, the rejection fails to demonstrate that the reference teaches the invention in the same level of detail as recited in Claim 11. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 11.

Claims 1 to 9 and 11 remain in the application. Claims 1 to 5, 7 to 9 and 11 have been amended. Claim 10 has been cancelled. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant(s) respectfully request allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions relating to the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicant(s).

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on June 12, 2006.

Attorney for Applicant(s) — June 12, 2006 Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,

Forrest Gunnison
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 32,899
Tel.: (831) 655-0880

GUNNISON, McKAY & HODGSON, L.L.P.
Garden West Office Plaza
1900 Garden Road, Suite 220
Monterey, CA 93940
(831) 655-0880
Fax (831) 655-0888